

chapters of the draft EIS. Comments may also address the adequacy of the draft EIS or the merits of the alternatives formulated and discussed in the statement. (Reviewers may wish to refer to the Council on Environmental Quality Regulations for implementing the procedural provisions of the National Environmental Policy Act at 40 CFR 1503.3 in addressing these points).

The Forest Service believes it is important to give reviewers notice at this early stage of several court rulings related to public participation in the environmental review process. First, reviewers of a draft EIS must structure their participation in the environmental review of the proposal so that it is meaningful and alerts an agency to the reviewer's position and contentions. *Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Corp. v. NRDC*, 435 U.S. 519, 553 (1978). Also, environmental objections that could be raised at the draft EIS stage but that are not raised until after completion of the final EIS may be waived or dismissed by the courts. *City of Angoon v. Hodel*, 803 F.2d 1016, 1022 (9th Cir. 1986) and *Wisconsin Heritages, Inc. v. Harris*, 490 F.Supp. 1334, 1338 (E.D. Wis. 1980). Because of these court rulings, it is very important that those interested in this proposed action participate by the close of the comment period so that substantive comments and objections are made available to the Forest Service at a time when it can meaningfully consider them and respond to them in the final EIS. To assist the Forest Service in identifying and considering issues and concerns on the proposed action, comments on the draft EIS should be specified as possible.

The final EIS is scheduled to be completed in December 1995. In the final EIS, the Forest Service is required to respond to comments and responses received during the comment period that pertain to the environmental consequences discussed in the draft EIS and applicable laws, regulations, and policies considered in making the decision regarding this proposal. Sonny O'Neal, Forest Supervisor, Wenatchee National Forest and Dennis Bschor, Forest Supervisor, Mt. Baker-Snoqualmie National Forest are the responsible officials. As responsible officials they will document the decision and reasons for the decision in the Record of Decision. That decision will be subject to Forest Service appeal regulations (36 CFR Part 217).

Dated: January 25, 1995.

**Sonny O'Neal,**

*Forest Supervisor, Wenatchee National Forest.*

Dated: January 26, 1995.

**Dennis E. Bschor,**

*Forest Supervisor, Mt. Baker-Snoqualmie National Forest.*

[FR Doc. 95-2537 Filed 2-1-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410-11-M

### **Opportunity To Comment on the Preparation of a Draft Environmental Impact Statement To Salvage Fire-Killed Timber on the Almanor Ranger District, Lassen National Forest**

**AGENCY:** Forest Service, USDA.

**ACTION:** Notice of intent to prepare an environmental impact statement for the Barkley Fire Salvage.

**SUMMARY:** The Department of Agriculture, Forest Service will prepare an environmental impact statement for a proposal to salvage approximately 2.6 million board feet (MMBF) of fire killed timber on 250 acres within the 44,000 acres burned by the Barkley Fire during September 1994 on the Lassen National Forest, Almanor Ranger District, Tehama County, California. The proposed project area is bordered by private timber land on the north, Deer Creek Canyon on the east, and the Ishi Wilderness to the west. The legal description is Sections 5, 6, 9, and 19 of T.26N., R.3E. M.D.M. The decision to be made is whether to salvage fire-killed timber from the Barkley Fire as proposed, and what mitigation measures will be in effect.

**DATES:** Written comments concerning the scope of the analysis and significant issues should be received by March 6, 1995.

**ADDRESSES:** Send comments about the proposed action and scope of the analysis to: Michael R. Williams, District Ranger, Almanor Ranger District, P.O. Box 767, Chester, California 96020.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Phil Tuma, District Forest Land Manager, Almanor Ranger District, P.O. Box 767, Chester, California 96020, (916) 258-2141.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** The proposed fire salvage areas are within the former Polk Springs Roadless Area, which was released to non-wilderness management by the California Wilderness Act of 1984. The Lassen National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan (LRMP) was completed in 1993. The management direction in the LRMP for the proposed

salvage area has management prescriptions of timber and semi-primitive non-motorized.

The proposal is whether or not to implement restoration projects on 250 acres within the Lower Deer Creek Management Area, including salvage timber harvest, fuels treatments and reforestation activities to restore the area to its natural vegetation type, and reduce fuel loading and the associated risk for future catastrophic intensity fires.

Public participation will be especially important at several points during the analysis. The first point is during the scoping process (40 CFR 1501.7). The Forest Service will be seeking information, comments and assistance from Federal, State, and local agencies and other individuals or organizations who may be interested in affected by the proposed action. This input will be used in the preparation of the draft environmental impact statement (DEIS).

The scoping process includes:

1. Identifying potential issues.
2. Eliminating insignificant issues or those which have been covered by a relevant previous environmental analysis.
3. Exploring additional alternatives.
4. Identifying potential environmental effects of the proposed action and alternatives.
5. Determining potential cooperating agencies and task assignments.

A public field trip to the proposed project area will be announced to the public to discuss issues, alternatives, and mitigations.

The following preliminary issues and alternatives have been developed.

#### *Issues*

(1) Timber harvesting and road construction create soil disturbance which may result in stream sedimentation. Sedimentation may affect water quality, anadromous fisheries habitat, and other aquatic resources. These activities may contribute to existing cumulative watershed effects, occurring from preceding fire impacts and recent salvage logging on private land.

(2) Salvage logging and associated road construction activities could affect the roadless characteristics of the area.

(3) Untreated excess fuels could increase the risk of another catastrophic fire that would damage or destroy resource values on public and private land.

(4) Vegetative biodiversity, viability, and recovery rates may be affected by the proposed projects.

#### *Alternatives*

(1) No Action. No timber salvage or restoration activities are proposed.

(2) This alternative proposes to salvage approximately 2.6 MMBF of fire

killed sawtimber and 1500 tons of fire killed biomass on approximately 250 acres using tractor and mechanical thinning logging systems. A total of 2.4 milses of road construction would be required.

(3) This alternative proposes to salvage 2.6 MMBF of fire killed timber and 1500 tons of biomass on approximately 250 acres using helicopter logging systems. The purchaser would be required to remove all the 4 inch dbh and larger fire killed trees in excess of wildlife requirements. No new roads would be constructed.

(4) This alternative proposes to salvage 2.6 MMBF of fire killed timber on approximately 250 acres using helicopter logging systems. The purchaser would remove all 10 inch dbh and larger fire killed trees in excess of wildlife requirements. A service contract would thin the sub-merchantable trees and treat excess slash. No new roads would be constructed.

The comment period on the draft environmental impact statement will be 45 days from the date the Environmental Protection Agency publishes the notice of availability in the **Federal Register**. The draft environmental impact statement is expected to be available by March of 1995.

The Forest Service believes, at this early stage, it is important to give reviewer's notice of several court rulings related to public participation in the environmental review process. First, reviewer's of the draft environmental impact statement must structure their participation in the environmental review of the proposal so that it is meaningful and alerts an agency to the reviewer's position and contentions. *Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Corp. v. NRDC*, 435 U.S. 519, 553 (1978). Also, environmental objections that could have been raised at the draft stage may be waived if not raised until after completion of the final environmental impact statement. *City of Angoon v. Hodel*, (9th Circuit, 1986 and *Wisconsin Heritages, Inc. v. Harris*, 495 F. Supp. 1334, 1338 (E.D. Wis. 1980). Because of these rulings, it is very important that those interested in this proposed action participate by the close of the 45 day comment period so that substantive comments and objections are made available to the Forest Service at a time when it can meaningfully consider them and respond to them in the final environmental impact statement.

To assist the Forest Service in identifying and considering issue and concerns on the proposed action, comments on the draft environmental

impact statement should be as specific as possible. It is also helpful if comments refer to specific pages or chapters of the draft statement. Comments may also address the adequacy of the draft environmental impact statement or the merits of the alternatives formulated and discussed in the statement. Reviewers may wish to refer to the Council on Environmental Quality Regulations for implementing the procedural provisions of The National Environmental Policy Act at CFR 1503.3 in addressing these points.

The responsible official for the Forest Service is Michael R. Williams, District Ranger, Almanor Ranger District, Lassen National Forest, P.O. Box 767, Chester, California 96020.

Dated: December 22, 1994.

**Elizabeth Norton,**

*Acting Forest Supervisor, Lassen National Forest.*

[FR Doc. 95-2670 Filed 2-1-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410-11-M

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

### International Trade Administration

[A-357-810]

#### **Preliminary Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value and Postponement of Final Determination: Oil Country Tubular Goods From Argentina**

**AGENCY:** Import Administration, International Trade Administration, Department of Commerce.

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** February 2, 1995.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** John Beck or Stuart Schaag, Office of Antidumping Investigations, Import Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, D.C. 20230; telephone (202) 482-3464 or (202) 482-0192, respectively.

#### **Preliminary Determination**

We preliminarily determine that oil country tubular goods (OCTG) from Argentina are being, or are likely to be, sold in the United States at less than fair value, as provided in section 733(b) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act). The estimated margins are shown in the "Suspension of Liquidation" section of this notice.

#### *Case History*

Since the initiation of this investigation on July 20, 1994 (59 FR 37962, July 26, 1994), the following events have occurred.

On August 15, 1994, the U.S. International Trade Commission (ITC) issued an affirmative preliminary determination.

On August 26, 1994, the Department determined that Siderca S.A.I.C. (Siderca), an Argentine exporter of the subject merchandise, should be the sole recipient of the antidumping questionnaire. This company accounted for at least 60 percent of exports of OCTG from Argentina during the period of investigation (POI).

On August 26, 1994, the Department sent an antidumping duty questionnaire to Siderca. The Department received initial questionnaire responses in September, October and November 1994. The Department received deficiency questionnaire responses in December 1994, and January 1995.

On November 1, 1994, the Department determined that Siderca's home market was not viable within the meaning of section 773(a)(1)(B) of the Act and 19 CFR 353.48, and that the People's Republic of China (PRC) was the appropriate third-country market for this investigation (see the November 1, 1994, memorandum from David L. Binder to Richard W. Moreland). This decision was consistent with our decision not to expand the period of investigation to include home market sales made pursuant to long-term contracts (see the November 3, 1994, memorandum from Richard W. Moreland to Barbara R. Stafford).

On November 10, 1994, Koppel Steel Corporation, U.S. Steel Group (a unit of USX Corporation) and USS/Kobe Steel Company, (the petitioners), timely requested that the Department postpone the preliminary determination in accordance with section 733(c)(1) of the Act (19 U.S.C. 1673b(c)(1)), and 19 CFR 353.15(c). We did so on November 15, 1994 (59 FR 60130, November 22, 1994).

On December 12, 1994, the petitioners submitted an allegation of sales at prices below the cost of production (COP) based on Siderca's sales to the PRC. The Department initiated a COP investigation on January 13, 1995 (see the January 13, 1995, memorandum from Gary Taverman to Barbara R. Stafford).

On December 16, 1994, Siderca timely requested that the final determination be postponed in accordance with 19 CFR 353.20(b) in the event of an affirmative preliminary determination.

#### *Scope of Investigation*

For purposes of this investigation, OCTG are hollow steel products of circular cross-section, including oil well casing, tubing, and drill pipe, of iron (other than cast iron) or steel (both